



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,774	12/30/2003	Anders Grunnet-Jepsen	42P15138	1056

8791 7590 09/06/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

PENG, CHARLIE YU

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2883

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/749,774	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GRUNNET-JEPSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Charlie Peng	<b>Art Unit</b> 2883	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133): Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-48 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-16 and 26-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 17-25 and 39-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed on 16 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that examiner improperly used applicant's disclosure as motivation for an obviousness-type rejection. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assessment of the rejection. Examiner merely pointed out that applicant's disclosure also supports a feature known in the art and the motivation is clearly stated in the Bendelli reference in lines 26-30 of column 2.

With regard to treating claim 9 on merits, it is noted that claim 9 is generic to specie elected by the applicant, meaning that all of the claimed limitations are therefore generic to all claims examined on merits. Claim 9 is also rejected. (See 35 USC 103 rejection below.)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 17-19, and 41-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,836,621 to Bendelli. Bendelli teaches an OADM comprising a Sagnac interferometer structure 5 having a tunable Bragg grating 2 inserted therein, a phase control element 7 coupled with the interferometer 5, and wherein the grating is tuned in such a way as to allocate the spectral response to the

Art Unit: 2883

new channel (singal) to be extracted (dropped) or inserted (added). (See at least Fig. 1 and description) Although Bendelli does not specifically state that the phase control element 7 controls the power of the signal, Bendelli teaches that by introducing a phase shift through the phase control element 7, a constructive or destructive interference will occur. Since constructive/destructive interference can be adjusted to control the power of the signal, (a fact also noted by the applicant in the Disclosure [0026]) it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the phase control element to control the power of the signal in combination with the rest of the component of the OADM. The motivation would be to eliminate the limitation of the tuning range arising from the constraint of not interfering with the channels in transit during the transient.

With specific reference to claim 19, Bendelli teaches the Bragg grating defines a Fabry-Perot cavity and that tuning can be carried out by means of a voltage command i.e., electronically modulated. (See column 4, paragraph 4, and Summary of Invention)

With specific reference to claim 42-44, 46 and 47, Bendelli teaches that a grating can easily be tuned by thermal stress (heating the waveguide) or by application of mechanical stress (physically changing the grating periods). Furthermore, when a Bragg grating is axially strained, the Bragg wavelength shifts because the grating spacing changes and because of a photoelastic induced change in the refractive index. (See conclusion for reference on this effect) Since the grating is part of the interferometer, claims 46 and 47 are also rejected.

With specific reference to claim 45, it is unclear to the examiner what is claimed as the Sagnac interferometer appears to have only one loop (or one arm), as opposed to an MZI interferometer, which has two arms. MZI interferometers operates due to the different path lengths in their two arms.

Claim 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendelli in view of U.S. Patent 4,442,750. Bendelli teaches the OADM with a Sagnac interferometer and a phase controller except for how phase adjustment is accomplished. It is well known in the art to use thermal or stress means to phase-modulate light in an optical fiber. Bowley phase-modulates light caused by pressure/piezoelectric variations or other interactions of various energy froms (magnetic, RF, thermal/heater) on specially coated fibers, as sensed through known fiber optic interferometric techniques. (See at least column 4, paragraph 3) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include any of such well-known phase-modulation means in Bendelli's invention. The motivation would be that using well-known and well-practiced techniques reduces experimental uncertainties and/or manufacturing cost.

Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendelli in view of U.S. Patent 4,898,468 to Udd. Bendelli teaches the OADM with a Sagnac interferometer and a phase controller except for a frequency adjustment circuit. Udda teaches phase modulator 17 and a frequency shift 19 in a Sagnac interferometer implemented with a fiber, which creates optical effect from thermal elongation of the fiber (heater) or shifts due to strain (piezoelectric). (See at least Fig. 1 and description)

Temperature increases will also cause optical fiber 21 to experience an optical pathlength change. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the frequency shifter in Bendelli's OADM. The motivation would be that by comparing the output of the system with the frequency shifter switched in the "off" and "on" position dependent and position independent modes, the location as well as the magnitude of a disturbance may be deduced.

With specific reference to claim 25, although Bendelli does not specifically speak of a "hitless" OADM, Bendelli and Udd combine to teach the OADM apparatus having the Sagnac interferometer with the frequency shifter and it must be able to at least perform the same. Furthermore, Bendelli stated that "Tuning of the wavelength selector is changed, so it has second wavelength and phase shift properties such that the entire stream of optical signals is coupled from an input port to an output port via the tunable wavelength selector, and the extracting and inserting operation is not performed while the tuning is changed". (Abstract) This is consistent with not inadvertently block a channel that should not be dropped as disclosed by the applicant.

Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendelli in view of U.S. Patent 5,999,292 to Dennis. Bendelli teaches the OADM with a Sagnac interferometer and a phase controller wherein a multiplexed stream enters through the port 1A of the circulator 1 and leaves this circulator through the port 1B, while the tuning channel can be extracted and inserted through the ports 3A and 3B respectively of the circulator 3. Bendelli does not teach a plurality of such Sagnac interferometers. Dennis teaches demultiplexer comprising a plurality of Sagnac

interferometers 14 connected in series wherein each interferometer is driven by a single microwave frequency through a phase modulator 19. (See at least Fig. 1 and description) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made integrate Bendelli's OADMs as part of the demultiplexer. The motivation would be to provide a device that utilizes only electronic power and control signals and requires no short latency optical power.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charlie Peng whose telephone number is (571) 272-2177. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 6 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Frank G. Font  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800